

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS
JULY 11, 2000

Views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

July 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS
JULY 11, 2000**

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

July 2000

Table of Contents
iii

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Atlanta, Georgia on July 12, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps' strategic planning process.

The cities where listening sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO, Sacramento, CA, Phoenix, AZ, Woburn, MA, Atlanta, GA, Omaha, NE, Honolulu, HI, Chicago, IL, Louisville, KY, Dallas, TX, Williamsburg, VA, New Brunswick, NJ, Anchorage, AK, and Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Woburn, Massachusetts, listening session. This session, hosted by the USACE North Atlantic Division (NAD), was conducted on July 12, 2000 at the Crowne Plaza Hotel Boston-Woburn. Twenty-five people attended the session (not including Corps personnel and the facilitation team).

The information collected from the listening sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Stephen Rhoades, USACE North Atlantic Division Commander, welcomed the audience to the listening session. General Rhoades began by informing the audience that there are six Corps Districts under his command, including New England, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and Europe. The General went on say that the nation lacks consensus in terms of its water resources needs. Therefore, it is important for agencies

such as the Corps to listen to the public. By identifying the public's concerns at a regional level across the country, these concerns can be distilled into national issues.

General Rhoades then walked the audience through the six water resource challenges identified by the Corps and displayed on banners in front of the audience. The General began with environmental restoration and then navigation. He emphasized that the nation's navigation infrastructure allows for the tremendous amount of world trade that has made our economy so robust, but he also acknowledged that the nation must strike a balance between economic growth and a healthy, sustainable environment.

The General then covered flood control and emergency response, two roles with which his Districts have been closely involved. Finally, he addressed the nation's aging water infrastructure and lack of suitable water in some communities.

General Rhoades explained that the purpose of this meeting was to listen to the audience's thoughts on these and other issues of importance to the public. The General stated that he would be personally hosting three of the 14 regional listening sessions (the other two will be held in Williamsburg, Virginia and New Brunswick, New Jersey). He also noted that the participants could visit the listening session website (<http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/challenges>) in a few days to see the proceedings from this meeting, as well as view the proceedings and comments from other listening sessions around the country.

The General concluded his welcoming remarks by saying that he would be circulating throughout the room during the day and he invited the audience members to feel free to talk with him during the listening session or at lunch. With that, the General turned the microphone over to Mr. Jim Creighton, the listening session facilitator and representative of the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.

Session Objectives

Mr. Creighton introduced himself to the audience and began by noting that the meeting was intended to be an interactive dialogue between the Corps and the public stakeholders, as well as among the stakeholders themselves. Mr. Creighton then outlined the issues he wanted the audience to consider during the day's discussions:

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing the nation today?
2. How are you personally affected by these challenges or needs?
3. What actions should be taken to meet these challenges?
4. Who should take these actions, i.e., the Federal government, state and local governments, and/or the private sector?

Mr. Creighton explained that the first two questions would be addressed in the morning session, and the latter two questions would be discussed in the afternoon. He went on to say that the Corps' Institute for Water Resources (IWR) had identified the six water resources challenges displayed on the banners as a starting point intended to "seed the clouds" for public discussion.

Mr. Creighton then outlined the meeting agenda with the participants. Although the agenda would serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

10:00-10:25 (A.M.)	Welcome
10:25-10:45	Overview of Workshop
10:45-11:40	Table Talk Sessions
11:40-12:25 (P.M.)	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
12:25-12:30	Dot Voting
12:30-1:30	Break for Lunch
1:30-2:45	Small Group Discussions
2:45-3:00	Afternoon Break
3:00-3:45	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:45-4:00	Closing Remarks
4:00-5:00	Informal Discussions

In order to develop the audience's ideas, Mr. Creighton explained that the listening session would involve a mix of small group discussions and large group report out sessions. Rather than allow people to make speeches, the purpose of this format would be to hear all of the participants' ideas. Mr. Creighton advised the participants that if they had questions about a specific Corps project, they should speak with Mr. David Lipsky, the Corps' Public Affairs Officer present at the meeting. He also requested that any written statements from the audience be presented to the session recorder, who would include them in the written report of the meeting.¹ The audience was also invited to provide written statements in electronic form via e-mail for inclusion in the meeting report.

Mr. Creighton then explained the format of the morning and afternoon activities in more detail. To begin with, the audience was asked to fill in a few of the tables, which grouped the audience into five tables of seven or eight people per table. The participants at each table introduced themselves to one another and were instructed to elect a spokesperson for the table. In keeping with the theme of listening to the public, the Corps members who joined each table were instructed by the facilitator not to serve as spokespersons, although they would be allowed to take notes for the group if so asked by the other participants at the table.

The participants would then be directed to discuss the challenges of importance to them, as well as the six challenges identified by the Corps. After the groups had sufficient time to develop their ideas, the spokesperson for each table would report out to the entire audience a succinct statement of each of the challenges that were identified at their table. These challenges would be recorded by a Corps staff member and projected onto a screen for everyone in the room to see. At the same time, other Corps members would write each challenge on a sheet of butcher paper, which would then be taped to a wall in the room.

Mr. Creighton explained that, while all of the concerns identified by the audience are important to the Corps, it would not be possible to discuss every one of them in detail.

¹ The attendees submitted no written statements at the July 11, 2000 listening session.

Therefore, each participant would receive four adhesive dots to affix to the challenges that concern them the most. In this way, the audience would vote for the issues of most importance to the group, which would then be discussed in more detail in the afternoon.

After the lunch break, the participants would gather around the challenges which interest them the most in order to develop “action items” to address these challenges. These action items would also be reported out to the entire audience. At the conclusion of the listening session, participants would be encouraged to linger and discuss their ideas or concerns with the Corps personnel in an informal setting.

When Mr. Creighton had concluded his instructions to the audience, one participant asked about the time frame they should consider with respect to the national challenges. Mr. Mark Gmitro, IWR, responded that the appropriate time horizon to consider would be five to ten years from the present.

Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

After approximately one hour of group discussions at the tables, Mr. Creighton asked the spokespersons from the five tables to take turns reporting each of the challenges that were identified at their table. Mr. Creighton also emphasized that, in order to avoid duplication and save time, once a challenge was reported out by one group, the other groups should not repeat that particular challenge. The participants identified 24 unique challenges, which are listed below:

- A. Water quality problems associated with flooding and stormwater runoff. Sub-issues related to this challenge include:
 - Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs): There is not enough storage to hold the stormwater during high flows, therefore it goes directly into the rivers.
 - Nonpoint source pollution is the largest contributor to water quality problems and most difficult to address due to numbers (different groups must coordinate and share their data with one another).
 - Increases in stormwater runoff due to development and resulting increase in impervious surfaces (impervious surfaces create an increase in peak flows and decrease in base flows).
- B. Improve and update how information is delivered to political decision-makers. Also, the information must be based on good science. Decision-makers need unbiased information on climatic change, the effects of development, dredging, and environmental sustainability, including wildlife habitat issues related to sprawl.
- C. Dredging and disposal of contaminated dredge material. This is related to the issue of water quality. It is difficult to find disposal sites for this material, and the costs of dredging are increased. Habitat/species restoration is a related issue.

- D. Aging infrastructure, particularly in the New England region. Age is affecting such structures as dams and water treatment facilities. Corps should join with states in finding comprehensive solutions. This issue is important here, in one of the oldest inhabited parts of the country, but will apply to the rest of the country as well as infrastructure ages in other areas. There are several related sub-issues:
- Need to agree on process for making decisions on aging infrastructure. Address safety, prioritization of restoration.
 - How to agree on the usefulness of a structure. Right now there is no agreed upon process for deciding what projects are no longer needed versus those that should be maintained.
 - Streamline regulatory process.
- E. Improve education of the public on the issues related to water resources.
- F. Improve data flow across jurisdictional borders. There are many projects and studies going on that cross state or watershed boundaries and we should avoid overlap and share data wherever possible.
- G. Regional watershed management. People who make decisions in one jurisdiction must understand how their actions will affect other jurisdictions. This topic also includes inter-basin and intra-basin management issues.
- H. Establish better standards for water quality and water quantity on a regional basis.
- I. Deadbeat dam owners. Private, municipal and even state dams must be inspected more thoroughly. There is a lack of maintenance and inspection in many instances. Some owners don't take responsibility and their dams may eventually fail.
- J. Coastal protection and management. This is an important issue for the nation as a whole. Much of the population lives along the coasts. Sea level rise due to global warming is a concern; impact is threat to property. We need a national presence to take the lead in coastal management. Need to study impact of hard structures on shorelines; study beach restoration projects.
- K. Use good science to develop water quality protection standards. For example, we need to find a replacement for MTBE (methyl tertiary-butyl ether), a fuel additive meant to help gasoline burn cleaner thereby improving air quality, but which is causing problems for water quality.
- L. Redevelopment of urban waterfronts and brownfields.
- M. Eutrophication (effects of nutrients in water bodies).
- N. Prioritize expenditures for environmental improvements.

- O. Restore natural instream flows. One participant noted that every single stream in Massachusetts has at least one dam on it.
- P. Lack of consumer confidence in the public water supplies. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is currently trying to address this issue. We also need better protection of public water supplies from contamination.
- Q. Beaver overpopulation in Massachusetts is causing flooding and property damage, as well as water supply contamination in some areas.
- R. Need to update Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain studies, particularly taking into account dam safety. FEMA's current flood maps do not take into account flows from dam failures.
- S. Address the apparent reduction in the Corps' regional flood control and disaster relief expertise.
- T. Combine state and federal dam permits to encourage better compliance and maintenance.
- U. Streamline and coordinate flood control services between FEMA and the Corps.
- V. Improve safety of water transport of hazardous substances.
- W. More consistency and coordination between the planning and regulatory functions of government at Federal and state levels. Governments need to look for efficiencies in the ways they provide their services to the public.
- X. Clarify the roles of the public and private sectors in policy implementation.

After the group spokespersons had finished reporting out the challenges identified at their tables, Mr. Creighton asked the audience members to write any comments they might have pertaining to any of the challenges on yellow self-adhesive sheets, and then stick them on the individual challenges posted around the room before leaving for lunch. The comments written on the yellow "stickies" have been transcribed in a table and are included as Appendix A.²

Mr. Creighton then asked the audience to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots, in order to identify which challenges were of most concern to the group in general. Each non-Corps workshop participants then took four dots and affixed them beside the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The four dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all four dots on a single challenge.

The facilitator then tallied the results of the dot voting, and the dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

² The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the "stickies" generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

A	18	M	0
B	12	N	2
C	23	O	4
D	21	P	0
E	6	Q	1
F	0	R	1
G	2	S	1
H	2	T	0
I	9	U	1
J	10	V	0
K	0	W	0
L	3	X	2

The seven challenges receiving the most votes were:

C	(23 votes)	Dredging and disposal of dredge material
D	(21)	Aging infrastructure
A	(18)	Water quality problems due to flooding and stormwater runoff
B	(12)	How to better provide scientific information to decision makers
J	(10)	Coastal protection and management
I	(9)	Deadbeat dam owners
E	(6)	Improve public education on water resource issues

Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the participants returned from lunch, Mr. Creighton explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon. He noted that the seven challenges that received the most votes were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. Two back-to-back sessions of approximately 30 to 40 minutes each would be held; after the first half-hour, the participants were asked to get up, choose a different challenge, and begin a discussion at that table. In this way, participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail two challenges of particular concern to them.

Mr. Creighton had one Corps staff member stand next to each of the seven challenges written on the butcher pads, in order to record the ideas generated by the small group discussion for each challenge. The facilitator also asked for volunteers from the audience to report out the results of the afternoon discussions. Before commencing the first half-hour discussion period, Mr. Creighton instructed the audience to assume that they actually had the power to actually implement their ideas. Mr. Creighton then asked the audience to consider two questions:

1. What action or actions should be taken with respect to each challenge?
2. Who should take such action(s), i.e., what should be the role of the Federal government, state and local governments, and private individuals and organizations?

The audience was also reminded to use the yellow adhesive sheets to record any additional thoughts they might have. Following these instructions, the participants gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads and began deliberating with others in their group. After half an hour, Mr. Creighton asked the participants to move to a different table to discuss another challenge of importance to them. Following the second half-hour of discussions, Mr. Creighton asked the spokesperson for each challenge to report the results of the discussions for their respective challenges. The results of the discussions are provided below³:

Challenge C. – Dredging and Disposal of Dredge Material

What Action Should be Taken?

- Provide more funding, including more money from parties who directly benefit from deeper channels and harbors.
- Create tax incentives.
- Streamline the permitting process by creating a “one-stop” permit source, rather than the current multi-agency system.
- Establish consensus on dredging issues by bringing stakeholders together.
- Strong leadership, possibly by state governor, is needed to build consensus.
- Regional decision-making authority.
- Tap the private sector for innovative technologies and new approaches to solving dredge issues.

Who Should Take Action?

- State government, particularly the governor’s office, should take the lead in addressing and solving dredge issues.

Challenge D. – Aging Infrastructure

What Action Should be Taken?

- Conduct an inventory of aging infrastructure and assess the condition and value of each structure.
- Identify a goal/plan for each resource or structure.
- Build consensus as to the purpose of infrastructure.
- Establish a funding program.
- Implement the plan based on the priorities established above.

³ The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

- Reevaluate the program periodically.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal government should develop and sustain a geotechnical, topographical Geographic Information Systems (GIS) that are available to all citizens.
- State government should use the information developed above to establish goals and set priorities.

Challenge A. – Water Quality Problems Due to Flooding and Stormwater Runoff

What Action Should be Taken?

- Issue/reissue National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to address point-source pollution.
- Eliminate Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs).
- Redefine various non-point sources of pollution as point sources to the extent possible.
- Enforce implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs).
- Establish better data on streamflows, water quality and precipitation.
- Develop better water quality standards, including state instream flow criteria and timely review by U.S. EPA of state standards.
- Develop standards for Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) in impaired waters. States should be directly involved first; for interstate waters, first look to compacts between the states before looking to Federal government. Develop better methodologies.
- Implementation of corrective measures.
- Investigate illegal sewer connections.
- Address urban runoff.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal, state and local governments can provide oversight.
- State and local governments can establish standards and methodologies, provide local oversight and enforcement.
- Interstate commissions can address TMDLs in interstate waters.

Challenge B. – How to Better Provide Scientific Information to Decision Makers⁴

What Action Should be Taken?

- Create a universal geospatial database, including some measure of reliability/ uncertainty.
- Standardized analytical methods.
- Unbiased interpretation of the results.

⁴ This discussion group consisted of Corps personnel only; therefore, no public input was developed for this particular challenge. These recommendations are presented purely in the spirit of providing ideas for public discussion.

- Easy access to the database, possibly using the internet.

Who Should Take Action?

- This should involve a consortium of agencies at all levels of government, academia, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Mr. Creighton asked whether members of the audience representing elected officials cared to comment on these suggestions. One such person responded that all good elected officials want unbiased information in order to make public policy. General Rhoades noted that there are many special interest groups that want to further their agendas by using biased information, or what the General termed “science fiction.” Another Congressional staff member replied that some public policy is unfortunately based on “science fiction,” but only because the elected officials don’t have accurate, unbiased information at their disposal. She continued by saying that it is up to the agencies to come forward to the elected officials with their information and interpretations.

Challenge J. – Coastal Protection and Management

What Action Should be Taken?

- Establish a national policy for coastal protection, taking into account such things as shore protection, environmental resources, flood and erosion control, recreation, and protection of open space. There must be a balanced representation of stakeholders, and policies must be based on good science and good economics.
- Make coastal protection a high national priority, commensurate with its importance to the nation.
- Set a high budgetary priority for coastal protection.
- Establish specific milestones for completing a list of national needs.

Who Should Take Action?

- This must be a cooperative effort between Federal, state and local governments.
- Role of the Federal government:
 1. Establish national standards, including technical design, economics and research;
 2. Coordinate efforts among Federal agencies;
 3. Direct research to determine cost sharing based upon necessity/importance to meet national standards;
 4. Consolidate permitting at a single governmental level (at state level, or federal level at the states’ discretion);
 5. Participate in Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement (OMRRR), to include periodic nourishment, and monitoring and evaluation.
- Role of the state governments:
 1. Develop and maintain a needs assessment in order to set priorities;
 2. Take the lead in initiating projects, as the states are in the best position to know what their needs are;
 3. Justify project “needs”;

4. Cost-sharing and OMRRR similar to the Federal role.
- Role of the local governments:
 1. Initiate project needs through the state;
 2. Participate in the development of each project, including the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) after the project is completed;
 3. Cost-share a significant portion of the project cost, both initially and on an ongoing basis, in order to become a real stakeholder in the project.

Challenge I. – Deadbeat Dam Owners (and other Urban Sprawl issues)⁵

What Action Should be Taken?

- Increase awareness of the issues at all levels of government and by the public.
- Create consensus in the struggle over private rights vs. public good.
- Establish guidelines for managing growth.
- Improve urban schools to make cities more attractive to young families.
- Acquire property rights to land (Nature Conservancy approach).
- Legislate boundaries on urban growth.
- Limit interbasin transfers of water.
- Maintain instream flows.
- Focus on developing underutilized lands and facilities (i.e., brownfields).
- Coordinate the efforts of Federal and state agencies.
- Western U.S. must support Eastern U.S. in brownfield development issues.
- Focus transportation dollars on inner cities to improve service and make older urban areas more viable.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal government can establish guidelines for growth and redevelopment of brownfields, provide funds to purchase lands, coordinate efforts of Federal agencies, and direct Federal transportation funds as needed.
- State governments can work with Federal agencies to establish guidelines and purchase lands.
- Local governments should enforce the guidelines established at state and Federal level, and can set their own limits and policies on local growth.
- Private sector funds can be leveraged by combining them with government funds to purchase land or redevelop areas. Private sector can participate in brownfield development.

⁵ This challenge was expanded during the group discussions to include many other issues related to development, and the group recommendations were reported out under the heading “Urban Sprawl.”

Challenge E. – Public Education

What Action Should be Taken?

- Educational Campaign for the Public.
 1. Public service announcements;
 2. Educational information at various projects, parks and public lands;
 3. Educational information mailed out with taxes or utility bills;
 4. Public service events with community groups;
 5. Educational programs at schools, including outreach speakers;
 6. Web sites;
 7. Press releases;
 8. Scholarships to study infrastructure and water resource issues.
- Educational Campaign for Government Officials.
 1. For municipal governments:
 - a. provide informed speakers from Federal/state agencies
 - b. provide liaisons/points of contact for other government agencies
 - c. provide assistance with presentations to the public.
 2. For state governments:
 - a. provide a list of contacts at Federal agencies
 - b. establish a state grants coordinator to locate money for projects/studies
 - c. have state and Federal agency representatives regularly brief state elected officials on agency actions.
 3. For Federal government:
 - a. federal and state agencies can provide informational briefings to elected officials
 - b. agencies could provide technical service on legislative issues
 - c. list of agency areas of responsibility and contacts
 - d. feedback from municipal governments on what works and what their needs are.

Who Should Take Action?

- Federal and state governments can provide educational materials, provide speakers, sponsor events and maintain websites.
- Private organizations and public interest groups can provide information, provide scholarships.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Mr. Creighton asked the participants to complete and hand in a comment form before leaving the meeting.⁶ He then invited the audience to remain in the room at the conclusion of the listening session and converse with the Corps staff, who would be available to talk with them in an informal setting. Someone in the audience asked how the information gathered at this

⁶ In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the listening sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. The Corps personnel collected these as the participants left the meeting.

listening session would be used by the Corps to make positive changes. Mr. Creighton turned to General Rhoades to respond to the question.

The General began by commenting that this was a valid question. He explained that this listening session is part of the Corps' effort to be part of good government. To this end, the General noted that the Corps is trying to reach consensus on what issues need to be addressed at the Federal level, and the public has a role to play in this endeavor. According to the General, whenever one talks about what the Corps of Engineers should or should not be involved in, this is a national concern. The General then thanked the audience for taking time out of their schedules to help the Corps. With that, General Rhoades adjourned the Woburn, Massachusetts listening session.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
Challenge A	
Water quality problems associated with flooding and stormwater runoff.	
1	Demand is exceeding capacity of groundwater aquifers and watersheds to supply. This is increasing pollution levels, causing salt water intrusion, and increasing stress on alternative sources, i.e., Quabbin Reservoir.
7	These are natural resources and places for wildlife and fish to inhabit. They are recreational areas and should be maintained for obvious reasons. Education (over used word) is important.
8	The use of these chemical solutions has far reaching effects on the environment, non-target species and industries that rely on clean water and healthy fish and shellfish stocks.
10	Avoid economic loss, avoid adverse environmental impacts from structural and systemic flood control projects.
11	Stormwater runoff – development changing hydrology feature – more runoff – faster higher peaks.
13	Water quality and supply major issue of this new century.
14	CSO's are flushing contaminants into rivers during heavy storms – drainage infrastructure and WWTP's can't handle the flow.
15	Construction poses a lot of issues with sedimentation and erosion permits becoming more strict.
17	\$4 bill damages/yr. Social impacts. Federal costs for response and recovery.
19	Higher flood flows (more damages) (more surface water lost for water supply). Stream system enlarges (environmental damage) (sediment and treas). Lower base flows (environmental damage). Less ground water for water supply wells.
Challenge B	
Improve and update how information is delivered to political decision makers.	
20	Climate change causes increased variability in meteorological conditions that can lead to extreme flood and drought events. We need better forecasting tools to manage water supply in the future.
Challenge C	
Dredging and disposal of contaminated dredge material.	
26	If some harbors are not deepened, lightering occurs with potential for spills affecting water quality and natural resources.
26	Locating disposal areas and monitoring disposal areas to reduce impacts on F&W, shorelines.
29	1) Need for cost-effective and safe cargo transport via water; 2) pot viability and competitiveness (pats provide decent paying jobs).

* ID indicates unique response that can be cross-referenced with the hard copy originals.

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
31	Disposal choices Safety Environmental concerns Economic development
32	Keeping our ports competitive.
Challenge D	
Aging infrastructure, particularly in the New England region.	
33	The big picture of each project must be looked at. What is the environmental impact of each project?
34	Increased water supply demands for urban areas and commercial use must be met reliably and economically to avoid limitations on regional growth and economic success.
35	Some (many) systems in NE are around 100 years old – very costly to repair/replace. Preventive maintenance is not being done but rather breaks are being repaired. Breaks create crisis shortages.
36	Groundwater and supply for wells Wetlands Flooding Water flow in dry seasons
37	CSO's are impacting watersheds, existing treatment systems are allocated and in need of repair. Many do not address new contaminants, i.e., MTBE or pesticides. New EPA proposed rule will require towns to install treatment systems.
38	Less time to complete repairs. Maintain flood control facilities in operational status. Put existing resources into actual repairs instead.
39	Bridges, roads need repairs to sustain adequate transportation. Dams need to be evaluated versus current day standards/needs to improve fisheries.
40	If water supplies/sewage facilities fail there will be economic repercussions and potential for environmental damage.
52	Get states to change laws that make it difficult to privatize public infrastructure. Government can't finance everything. Private sector is willing but often prevented from doing so.
Challenge E	
Improve education of the public on the issues related to water resources.	
25	Funding new projects is always easier than funding O&M. Need to avoid deferred maintenance.
43	If the citizens realize the value of the river in all of above ways, it will assist with preservation for all uses of river.
44	To show overall impact of smart growth.
45	Need to provide information to municipal and state authorities, increase educational outreach.
Challenge F	
Improve data flow across jurisdictional borders.	

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
22	Communication/networking. Best use of limited resources. Leads to better standards/protection.
Challenge G	
Regional watershed management.	
2	Without adequate water supply economic growth is not sustainable
5	Available fresh water supplies in many suburban areas (non-MWRA) cannot accommodate both lawn watering and potable/fire protection needs.
6	Water resources of all types are being compromised as economic development, housing takes over more areas that previously were rural or suburban and provided water resource benefits.
9	New development unplanned changes watershed and hydraulics and hydrology. Change hazard potential of streams, ponds and dams.
46	Watersheds cross political boundaries, require federal, state, and local agencies to develop effective teams to deal with problems on a watershed basis.
47	Full representation/participation of constituents/resources is crucial.
49	Control power plant releases to reduce impacts to water quality/fisheries. Need for better overall management/conservation. Need to control storm runoff.
68	Help solve shortages of water and prevent flooding.
Challenge H	
Establish better standards for water quality and water quantity on a regional basis.	
12	Species diversity. Economic development. Public health.
16	It is going to effect NHDOT tremendously how do we continue our efforts effectively but still adhere to regulations.
18	Significant source of impairment. Very broad.
48	Extensive amount of work. Limited resources available. Need cooperative efforts.
50	Serious impacts on F&WL. Varying standards within communities produces chaos during winter/summer. Need for sustaining minimum/maximum daily flows.
51	Current laws for regulating uses are inadequate leading to seasonal shortages. Need to set standards for sewerage releases (combined sewer overflow systems).
Challenge I	
Deadbeat dam owners.	
3	Increases risk of flooding and stress on watersheds and groundwater.
4	Reduces the quality of life.

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
21	Dam removal is a popular aquatic restoration alternative. It must be approached carefully in northern rivers to avoid increase ice jam frequency and occurrence and ice-induced scour that mobilizes contaminated sediment.
30	Dam failure could cause discharge of contaminated sediment downstream into water column and possibly to another state.
41	Many existing structures not meeting current design safety standards – lives and property at risk.
53	State and municipalities does not have money or staff to repair dams.
54	Resources upstream and downstream are dependent on dam safety and operation.
Challenge J	
Coastal protection and management.	
27	The value of these areas for water retention, aesthetics, habitat et., must be of equal weight with development benefits.
28	Reverse decline in species/habitat. Improve quality of environment. Reduce need for future restriction regulatory controls.
55	Jetties realign littoral drift/F&WS. Need to relook at <u>need</u> for project (may need to remove/modify).
56	The importance and impact of the nation's coastlines are incredible. Coastal protection and management issues in an era of rising sea levels can only be more important in future. We need a national presence in coastal water resource management.
Challenge K	
Use good science to develop water quality protection standards.	
23	Potential for impacts of large-scale and long-term climatic changes.
57	Impacts water quality. Need safe alternatives. Protection of air and water quality.
Challenge L	
Redevelopment of urban waterfronts and brownfields.	
24	1-84 / 1-91 traffic – do we build more highways, bus routes, trains? What is balance of moving people at the least expense of the environment/river/wetlands.
58	Rivers flowing through cities can be a significant catalyst for economic and community recovery. Without such recovery people must commute to other cities to work and recreate.
Challenge M	
Eutrophication (effects of nutrients in water bodies).	
59	Impairs use of rivers/lakes for swimming and recreation.
Challenge N	
Prioritize expenditures for environmental improvements.	
60	The loss of protected water resource areas and values is increasing as land uses are changing (farm to housing; rural to suburban) leading to more impervious surfaces, altered drainage and often reduced protection for water resources.

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
61	Limit to dollars available.
Challenge O	
Restore natural instream flows.	
62	Natural ecosystem has been damaged especially low summer flows – water quantity, quality (temp, DO) issues. Fish passage also impacted by dams.
63	Water supply sources are becoming scarce. Urban development at limits of water supply. Instream flow reduction causing aquatic habitat impacts.
Challenge P	
Lack of consumer confidence in the public water supplies.	
64	Species diversity and protection. Economics of instream and offstream water use. Quality of life, aesthetics and recreation.
65	Public water suppliers are not getting public support/funding needed – consumers are over-spending on bottled water.
Challenge Q	
Beaver overpopulation in Massachusetts is causing flooding and property damage, as well as water supply contamination in some areas.	
66	Flooding and water quality issues. Jardia bacteria and dam over topping.
Challenge R	
Need to update Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain studies, particularly taking into account dam safety.	
42	FEMA flood maps outdated in most cases and don't consider dam failures and impoundments. Rapid growth and development.
Challenge S	
Address the apparent reduction of the Corps' regional flood control and disaster relief expertise.	
67	Provide a central agency to get technical information and expertise that has the public's welfare as a first priority.
Challenge T	
Combine state and federal dam permits to encourage better compliance and maintenance.	
69	Coordinated self examination of local, state, and federal bureaucracy to determine how they can better meet the fast changing needs of the public.
Challenge U	
Streamline and coordinate flood control services between FEMA and the Corps.	
Challenge V	
Improve safety of water transport of hazardous substances.	
71	Risk to coastal ecosystem, recreational usage. Need safe and navigable channels.
Challenge W	
More consistency and coordination between the planning and regulatory functions of government at federal and state levels.	
70	Efficiency in completing capital projects. Reducing losses for claims. Allows partners to deal with one agency. Hopefully get projects completed more quickly.

WOBURN, MASSACHUSETTS LISTENING SESSION	
[The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]	
ID #	Identified Challenge
72	Effectively meeting water resource management needs in the future will require a true partnership of federal, state, and local forces. There is too much adversarial positioning and process and not enough focus on goals. Corps authorities are too rigid, too narrowly focused, and not sufficiently independent of short-term administration controls/directions, etc. Need to de-bundle Corps – do a complete reanalysis of procedures, etc. – slim down – get lean and mean.
73	Need appropriate planning and regulatory guidance from federal and state levels with action at local level. Corps needs to take lead in water resources infrastructure issues.
Challenge X	
Clarify the roles of the public and private sectors in policy implementation.	
74	Role of government and private sector. Corps should not be competing with private sector to provide project engineering, design, and management.

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPTION OF NOTES FROM SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIONS

[No notes were generated by the small group discussions for inclusion in this report.]

APPENDIX C

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

[No public statements or other materials were submitted at the July 11, 2000 listening session.]

